

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The office action of September 28, 2005 and the Advisory Action of November 22, 2005 have been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 19-26, 28 and 30-34 remain pending in this application.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Winder for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephonic interview of January 19, 2006.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 19-26, 28 and 31-33 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,487,590 to Foley et al. ("Foley") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,339,790 to Inoue. Applicants respectfully continue to traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that when polled by the client, the event manager provides the client with an update of any changes to the properties to which the client has subscribed. As agreed to during the telephonic interview, the combination of Foley and Inoue, even if proper, does not result in the claim 1 combination of features.

Foley lacks a teaching or suggestion of an event manager that, when polled by a client, provides the client with an update of any changes to the properties to which the client has subscribed as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Foley provides an automated technique to keep up on attribute changes where each client application registers with the object server once and, for each registered attribute, receives real time status updates or notification of events, alarms or configuration changes. In the Foley scheme each client application *makes a single request up front by registering* for current status and configuration information about selected attributes and receives notification of changes via callback. Thus, the object server, and not any client application, polls each attribute which one or more clients has requested to be monitored. Inoue fails to remedy the defects of Foley. For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims, 2-6 and 8-14 are patentably distinct from the combination of Foley and Inoue.

Applicants have amended claim 19 to clarify that the invention includes receiving a *polling* request for status information from a client regarding the property, wherein the client has a client time stamp that is earlier than the property time stamp; and providing the change information to the client via the network *responsive to the polling request*. As discussed during

the interview, the combination of Foley and Inoue, even if proper, does not teach or suggest providing the change information to the client via the network *responsive to the polling request*.

Claim 21 has been amended to clarify that the event manager includes computer-executable instructions that, if the client time stamp is earlier than the time stamp corresponding to when the property that the client polled last changed value, *provides the property value information to the client in response to the polling request*. As discussed during the interview, the combination of Foley and Inoue, even if proper, lacks a teaching or suggestion of at least this feature of claim 21.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 19 and 21 are patentably distinct from the combination of Foley and Inoue. Claim 20, which depends from claim 19, and claims 22-26, 28 and 31-33, which each directly or indirectly depend from claim 21, are patentably distinct over the applied art for the same reasons as their base claim, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

Claims 10 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley in view of Inoue as applied to claims 1 and 21, respectively, and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,665,731 to Kumar et al. ("Kumar"). Claims 14 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley in view of Inoue as applied to claims 1 and 21, respectively, and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,546,419 to Humpleman et al. ("Humpleman"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 10 and 14 depend from claim 1 and claims 30 and 34 depend from claim 21. Neither Humpleman nor Kumar overcome the deficiencies noted with respect to Foley and Inoue. As such, claims 10, 14, 20 and 34 are allowable for at least this reason over the applied art.

Appln. No.: 09/894,446  
Amendment dated January 23, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 28, 2005  
Reply to Advisory Action of November 22, 2005

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 23, 2006

By:



---

Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001  
GDF:lab